

Response to OA of July 12, 2005

Page 8 of 13

Ser. No. 09/990,837

REMARKS

Applicant graciously appreciates the Office's attention to the instant application and indication of allowed (claim 33) and allowable subject matter (claims 2, 3, 8, 14 and 15).

- 5 In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. This amendment is believed to be fully responsive to all issues raised in the July 12, 2005 Office Action.

10 Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a): Yan in view of Farros

- The Office rejected claims 1, 4, 6, 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Yan et al. (USPN 6,003,065, referred to as the Yan reference) in view of Farros et al. (USPN 6,717,686, referred to as the Farros reference). Obviousness under §103 requires (i) some suggestion or
15 motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings; (ii) a reasonable expectation of success; and (iii) that the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations, see MPEP §2143.

20

Claims 1, 4, 6 and 10-12

 Claim 1 recites:

A method comprising:

- communicating a file from a client to a server, the file containing*
25 *information;*
 generating an applet based on the information;
 communicating the applet from the server to the client;
 executing the applet on the client to thereby cause searching for
 an additional file; and
30 *communicating the additional file to the server.*

Response to OA of July 12, 2005

Page 9 of 13

Ser. No. 09/990,837

Applicant submits that the subject matter of claim 1 is patentable over the Yan reference in view of the Farros reference. Applicant asserts that a prima facie rejection has not been made as the evidence of record to teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 1 is insufficient.

- 5 The Office admits that the Yan reference "fails to disclose that the executing causes searching for an additional file, and communicating the additional file to the server" (OA 07/12/05 at page 2). Applicant agrees.

 The Office then states that the Farros reference discloses that it would have been obvious to put printer information in a file (citing col. 10, line 62 to
10 col. 11, line 2) and that "a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Yan by executing the applet on the client to cause searching for this file containing printer information and communicating the file to the server" (OA 07/12/05 at page 3). Applicant disagrees.

- 15 The cited portion of the Farros reference (col. 10, line 62 to col. 11, line 2) refers to "printer specific files":

 [The process server 13d may create a printer specific file associated with the information that may not be included in the converted image file, such as product, paper color, media type, etc (Step 117). Printer specific
20 files may include printer facility specific information, such as attributes and the like.

 Subsequent use of the "printer specific files" is described at col. 11, lines 12-15, where the process server 13d may then (i) backup all the printer specific
25 files; (ii) compress the printer specific files; and (iii) copy the compressed files to an appropriate location so that the compressed files may be downloaded by a remote or local printer facility. Thus, the references fail to disclose, teach or suggest searching for an additional file.

- As Applicant finds no evidence as to the "searching" recited in claim 1,
30 i.e., "*executing the applet on the client to thereby cause searching for an additional file*" and "*communicating the additional file to the server*", Applicant

Response to OA of July 12, 2005

Page 10 of 13

Ser. No. 09/990,837

submits that there is insufficient evidence to support a prima facie rejection under §103(a).

Claims 4, 6 and 10-12 depend on claim 1 and are believed patentable over the Yan reference and the Farros reference for at least the same reasons
5 as claim 1.

Claim 9

Claim 9 depends on claim 1 and recites: *wherein the executing includes searching a memory associated with a camera*. Applicant submits that claim 9
10 is patentable over the Yan reference in view of the Farros reference.

The Office cites the Yan reference at col. 24, lines 28-40, which discloses a printer device that is coupled to a digital camera whereby the camera downloads into the printer an instruction application for printing along with the actual image data. Thus, Applicant submits that insufficient evidence
15 exists as to the searching a memory associated with a camera as recited in claim 9.

Claim 5

The Office rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious
20 over the Yan reference in view of the Farros reference and further in view of Skibbie et al. (USPN 6910128), referred to as the Skibbie reference. Applicant fails to find evidence in the Yan, Farros and Skibbie references sufficient to support a prima facie rejection under §103. As argued above, the combination of the Yan and Farros reference do not render the subject matter of claim 1
25 obvious. Skibbie discloses a system for verifying applet signatures (Abstract); however, Applicant submits that verification of applet signatures does not fill the evidentiary void. Consequently, Applicant submits that claim 5 is patentable.

Claims 13, 18-24

30 The Office rejected claims 13 and 18-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Adolfsson (USPN 6092078), referred to as the Adolfsson

Response to OA of July 12, 2005

Page 11 of 13

Ser. No. 09/990,837

reference, in view of Wood et al. (USPN 6732162), referred to as the Wood reference.

Claim 13 recites:

A method for configuring a server comprising:

- 5 *communicating a file from a client to the server, the file containing information;*
- generating an applet based on the information;*
- communicating the applet from the server to the client;*
- executing the applet on the client to thereby cause searching for*
- 10 *an additional file;*
- communicating the additional file to the server; and*
- configuring the server using at least the additional file.*

The Office states that the Adolfsson reference fails to disclose searching

15 by the client for an additional file. Applicant agrees. The Office then states that the Wood reference discloses configuring a Web server by allowing a client to search for an additional file and upload the file through an applet (citing col. 5, lines 21-48). Applicant disagrees as the media object identifier of the Wood reference, which may take the form of a Java applet, has the function of

20 receiving a media object, display a thumbnail or visual representation of the object and (optionally) perform processing on the object (col. 5, lines 21-32). In sum, it does not have the function of searching, as recited in claim 13.

For the foregoing reason, Applicant submits that insufficient evidence exists to support a prima facie rejection of claim 13 under §103 based on the

25 Adolfsson reference and the Wood reference. Claims 18-20 depend on claim 13 and are believed patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 13.

Claim 21 recites, in part:

- 30 *executing the applet on the client to thereby cause searching by the client for an additional file;*
- communicating the additional file to the server; and*

Response to OA of July 12, 2005

Page 12 of 13

Ser. No. 09/990,837

configuring the Web server using at least the additional file

As searching is recited in claim 21, Applicant reiterates the evidence and arguments presented for claim 13. Claims 22-24 depend on claim 21 and are
5 believed patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 21.

Claim 16

The Office rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over the Adolfsson reference in view of the Wood reference and further in view
10 of the Farros reference. Applicant fails to find evidence in the Adolfsson, Wood and Farros references sufficient to support a prima facie rejection under §103.

As argued above, the combination of the Adolfsson reference and the Wood reference do not render the subject matter of claim 13 obvious, upon which claim 16 depends. The Farros reference fails to fill the evidentiary void
15 as argued with respect to the searching of claim 1 (see above).

Claim 17

The Office rejected claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over the Adolfsson reference in view of the Wood reference and further in view
20 of the Skibbie reference. Applicant fails to find evidence in the Adolfsson, Wood and Skibbie references sufficient to support a prima facie rejection under §103.

As argued above, the combination of the Adolfsson and Wood reference do not render the subject matter of claim 13 obvious, upon which claim 17
25 depends. Skibbie discloses a system for verifying applet signatures (Abstract); however, Applicant submits that verification of applet signatures does not fill the evidentiary void.

Conclusion

30 Claims 1-24 and 33 are pending and believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt

Response to OA of July 12, 2005

Page 13 of 13

Ser. No. 09/990,837

issuance of the present application. Should any issue remain that prevents immediate issuance of the application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss the unresolved issue.

5

Respectfully Submitted,


Lee & Hayes, PLLC

421 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 500

Spokane, WA 99201

10

15

Dated: 10-7-05

Name: Brian J. Pangrle

Reg. No. 42,973

Phone No. (509) 324-9256 ext. 231